

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 through 3, 13, 14, 19 through 21, and 30 are pending, with Claims 1, 13, and 19 being independent. Claims 4 through 11, 15 through 18, and 22 through 29 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1 through 3, 13, 14, and 19 through 21 have been amended. For example, Claim 1 has been amended to include features formulated upon the basis of rejected, cancelled Claim 8, with further amendments.

Claims 1 through 11 and 13 through 30 were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over US 2005/0028207 A1 (Finseth, et al.), US 2002/0129368 A1 (Schlack, et al.), US 2003/0149988 A1 (Ellis, et al.), and US 2002/0095676 A1 (Knee, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 13, and 19 variously recite, *inter alia*, generating a user profile of the common user of the data receiving apparatus and the recording apparatus on the basis of (a) a view history of a broadcast program received by the receiving unit and (b) the booking information (about a program, recording of which is booked in the recording apparatus) which is input, wherein the booking of recording the program in the recording apparatus (Claims 1 and 19) or unit (Claim 13) is based on a user instruction.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Finseth, et al., Schlack, et al., Ellis, et al., and Knee, et al., even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that the documents could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1, 13, and 19.

The Official Action relies upon Finseth, et al. for showing, e.g., use of view history; however, the Official Action states at page 7 that Finseth, et al. lacks booking information, and therefore relies upon Ellis, et al. and Knee, et al.

However, Applicants respectfully traverse such reliance. The Official Action relies, e.g., upon Ellis, et al. [0143], which states that a program may be recorded and a copy of user directories may be provided. Meanwhile, Applicants respectfully submit that Knee, et al. shows, e.g., a weight value of 1.0 for recording a program and a weight value of 0.5 for watching for at least five minutes [0035]. However, Applicants respectfully submit that such constitutes neither a description nor a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1, 13, and 19. In particular, with respect to Knee, et al., Applicants respectfully submit that Knee, et al.'s weight value for recording a program is different from the claimed booking information (where recording is booked in the recording apparatus) input as claimed.

It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSC/ulp

FGHS_WS 1411772v1